

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 26 are amended and claims 27-32 are added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 21 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,329) in view of Shimamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,672). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1. Specifically, the applied references fail to disclose or suggest the features of a first portion through which the still-image data or a given command is input from an external MPU; and a second port through which the moving-image data, which is transferred serially over a serial transfer line from the external MPU, is input as a differential signal, as recited in amended claim 1.

Ohguchi discloses a video input attached to an A-D converter, the output of which is attached to a switch 22, which alternately sends the moving-image data and the still-image data to buffer memory (41, 42). Thus, the moving-image data and still-image data are not input from an external MPU. Moreover, as admitted, Ohguchi fails to teach a reception circuit which differentially amplifies a differential signal as claimed.

Shimamoto fails to make up for this deficiency. The Office Action relies on Shimamoto to disclose a reception circuit which differentially amplifies the differential signal input from the second port and creates moving-image data in a parallel state. However, Shimamoto does not disclose inputting the moving-image data or the still-image data from an external MPU.

Because Ohguchi and Shimamoto fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, claims 1 defines over the applied art.

Regarding claims 6 and 21, it is respectfully submitted that because these claims depend from claim 1, these claims are allowable at least for the reasons stated regarding claim 1.

Regarding claim 26, the Office Action alleges that Ohguchi teaches a CPU and cites col. 3, line 24. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. In particular, the CPU disclosed in Ohguchi does not supply the command, the still-image data, and the moving-image data to the display unit as required in claim 26. Rather, the CPU in Ohguchi is used to control memory controllers 31 and 32 (Fig. 3) and does not supply the command, the still-image data, and the moving-image data to the display unit.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6, 21 and 26 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohguchi and Shimamoto and further in view of Silverman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,603; "Silverman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Ohguchi and Shimamoto are deficient for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Silverman fails to make up for these deficiencies. Silverman is relied upon in the Office Action to disclose a serial transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 16 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-5, 7-10 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Ohguchi and Shimamoto and further in view of Chida (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,863). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that because claims 2, 7 and 22 depend from claim 1, these claims are allowable at least for the reasons stated regarding claim 1.

Regarding claims 3-5, 8-10 and 23-25, it is respectfully submitted that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in these claims.

Specifically, Ohguchi and Shimamoto are deficient at least for the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, and Chida fails to make up for these deficiencies. The Office Action alleges that Chida discloses "when the receiving side displays only the valid area, the system control unit 26 of the receiving side controls the synthesizing/processing unit 125 so and the unit 125 extracts a part of the image stored in the receiving video RAM 121 based on the validity information of the blocks" (Figs. 11a, col. 9, lines 48-52).

However, claims 3-5, 8-10 and 23-28 recite the validation signal is used as a synchronization signal that synchronizes the writing of the moving-image data. It is respectfully submitted that the terms "synchronizing" and "synthesizing" are not synonymous. Therefore, the disclosure of Chida does not make up for the deficiencies of Ohguchi and Shimamoto.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 3-5, 7-10 and 22-25 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohguchi and Shimamoto and further in view of Silverman. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in these claims. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Ohguchi and Shimamoto are deficient for the reasons stated above regarding claim 1, and Silverman fails to make up for these deficiencies. Silverman is relied upon in the Office Action to disclose a serial transfer line in accordance with a USB standard and an IEEE 1394 standard.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

New independent claims 27-28 are added. New claim 27 recites, inter alia, that the first and second bus lines are independent and that the still-image data can be rewritten irrespective of the timing at which the moving-image data is rewritten in the RAM. See Applicant's Figs. 1 and 10 and paragraphs [0009] and [0010].

Ohguchi as construed teaches shared lines connected by a switch 22. Because only one line can be used at a time, the lines are not independent and the structure cannot meet the functional recitation. The secondary references fails to overcome deficiencies of Ohguchi. As such, claim 27 defines over the applied art.

New claim 28 recites, inter alia, that the first control circuit controls both the still and moving images.

Ohguchi teaches separate controllers 31, 32, one for each data type. The secondary references fail to overcome the deficiencies of Ohguchi. As such, claim 28 defines over the applied art.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-32 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Date: September 10, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--